

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claim 9 has been cancelled, and claim 1 has been amended to correct typographical errors. In addition, claim 8 has been amended such that the method claimed therein is "tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus)".

Applicant believes that the above changes answer the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 8 and 10 (claim 9 having been cancelled), and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,787,131 to Bottomley.

The Bottomley patent discloses a method and apparatus for mitigation of self interference using array processing, which includes multiple antenna receiving branches, and each branch having estimating means.

As noted in MPEP §2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 includes the limitation "a first estimating means in one branch of the multiple antenna receiving branches is operatively connected to a second estimating means in a further branch of the multiple antenna receiving branches for using at least a part of the channel parameter estimate in the one branch as an aid for estimating at least a receiving channel parameter in the further branch" (a similar limitation appears in independent claim 8).

The Examiner has indicated that Bottomley teaches this limitation:

"wherein a first estimating means (204, 306 and 302 connected to $r_a(n)$ in Fig. 3) in one branch of the multiple antenna receiving branches ($r_a(n)$ in Fig. 3) is operatively connected to a second estimating means (204, 306 and 302 connected to $r_b(n)$ in Fig. 3) in a further branch of the multiple antenna receiving branches $r_b(n)$ in Fig. 3) for using at least a part of the channel parameter estimate in the one branch as an aid for estimating at least a receiving channel parameter in the further branch (302 from estimating means of $r_a(n)$ branch is connected to 306 from channel estimating means of $r_b(n)$ in Fig. 3; furthermore, 302 from estimating means of $r_b(n)$ branch is connected to 306 from channel estimating means of $r_a(n)$ in Fig. 3)".

Applicant submits that the Examiner is mistaken. Applicant notes that Bottomley clearly shows separate channel estimators 302 for each of the branches $r_a(n)$ and $r_b(n)$. While Bottomley shows the outputs from these two channel estimators being co-processed in an impairment correlation processor 306 and a weight processor 204 for providing weights for respective half complex multipliers (HCM) 208, the two channel estimators operate independently from each

other. Hence, Applicant submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion of the estimating means in the further branch using at least a part of the channel parameter estimate in the one branch as an aid for estimating at least a receiving channel parameter in the further branch.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-8 and 10, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by Edward W. Goodman
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611